UNITED NATIONS

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

No. 2/94 January 1994

NELSON MANDELA AND F. W. DE KLERK

AWARDED

1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

FOR MOMENTOUS CONTRIBUTION TO PEACEFUL

ELIMINATION OF APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA

Statements by Professor Francis Sejersted*, Chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee*, Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress of South Africa and President. F. W. de Klerk at the award ceremony in Oslo on 19 December 1993.

***(c) The Nobel Foundation, 1993**

All material in these Notes and Documents, which are published by the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, may be freely reprinted. Acknowledgement, together with a copy of the publication containing the reprint, would be appreciated. United Nations, New York, 10017

94-07829

CONTENTS

Page

I. STATEMENT BY PROFESSOR FRANCIS SEJERSTED, CHAIRMAN OF THE NORWEGIAN NOBEL COMMITTEE WHEN PRESENTING THE 1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE.....3

II. STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE 1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE BY NELSON MANDELA, PRESIDENT OF THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA.....6

III. STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE 1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE BY F. W. DE KLERK, STATE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA.....10

I. STATEMENT BY MR. FRANCIS SEJERSTED, CHAIRMAN OF THE NORWEGIAN NOBEL COMMITTEE WHEN PRESENTING THE 1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The Norwegian Nobel Committee has decided to award the Nobel Peace Prize for 1993 to Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk for their work for the peaceful termination of the apartheid regime, and for laying the foundations for a new, democratic South Africa. It is a great pleasure to be able to welcome the two prize winners here today.

This is the third time the Nobel Committee has awarded the prize to human rights advocates who have actively participated in the struggle against the apartheid regime in South Africa. There are many reasons why South Africa has attracted so much attention. After the second world war and the fall of the Hitler regime, racism as a system was thoroughly discredited. The general trend was to remove institutionalised racial barriers at the same time as the old colonial empires were being dismantled. But just when this was the general trend, South Africa chose to move in the opposite direction. From 1948 onwards the apartheid regime was consolidated and systemically, through legislation and organisational forms, developed into a brutal regime of oppression based on criteria of race alone. Thus it also became the symbol of a particularly debasing form of oppression. The apartheid regime gave racism a face.

When ANC leader Albert Lutuli was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1960, more than a generation ago, he drew attention to the systematic, institutionalised undermining of human equality. As a Christian, Lutuli anchored the idea of equality in his religious beliefs:

> "As a Christian and patriot, I could not look on while systematic attempts were made, almost in every department of life, to debase the God-factor in man or to set a limit beyond which the human being in his black form might not strive to serve his Creator to the best of his ability. To remain neutral in a situation where the laws of the land virtually criticised God for having created men of color was the sort of thing I could not, as a Christian, tolerate".

By awarding the prize for 1960 to Lutuli, the Norwegian Nobel Committee initiated what was in some regards a new policy. From then on, the struggle for human rights became a much more important criterion for awarding the peace prize than it had been previously. This criterion has been controversial, for it has been pointed out that work for human rights has created conflicts in many areas. On the surface, and in the short-term, this is true. But it also seems true that on the whole the committee's

READEX
FICHE

policy has gained widespread support throughout the world and within different cultures.

If anything close to a stable peace is to be achieved, respect for each others' character, integrity and dignity is an absolute requirement. This is an important point in Immanuel Kant's famous 200-year-old essay on everlasting peace. He links peace to the idea of justice, which was the cornerstone of his political philosophy. During the cold war, and with the type of ideologically-based oppression that existed in the totalitarian regimes then, one could have been led to believe that peace was dependent on the balance of terror, and that oppression created stability. These must have been the thoughts motivating those who criticised any consideration of the struggle for human rights as work for peace. Today we know that these regimes of oppression were the most fragile. They did not yield freedom, nor did they offer stability. The breaches of the most fundamental human rights and the systematic undermining of human dignity and self-respect were bound to give rise to opposition. Such regimes always find themselves in a vicious circle sooner or later, facing the danger of disintegration into wars, chaos and bloodshed.

South Africa had long been caught up in such a vicious circle. However, on the eve of the 1990s the regime reversed its policies under its new president, Frederik Willem de Klerk. Nelson Mandela was released unconditionally after nearly 28 years of imprisonment, and the dismantling of apartheid became the official policy of the regime. To what degree this was a strategic adjustment to a situation characterised by internal dissolution or the fruits of moral reflection as well, each individual participant must determine for himself. South Africa had long been caught up in a vicious circle, and only time can show whether these initiatives came too late.

The natural partner in the negotiations that were initiated was the ANC, whose leader Nelson Mandela went straight from prison to the negotiating table. Mandela had early taken a stand as an active opponent of apartheid. Initially he was among those who were inspired by Gandhi's methods of non-violence. But the climate hardened inexorably, as the Sharpeville massacre of 1960 showed. In 1962 Mandela was imprisoned, and his confinement would last almost 28 years. Some months after his release in 1990 we had the pleasure of receiving Mandela here in Oslo to the so-called "hate conference" organised by the Nobel Committee in cooperation with the Eli Wiesel Foundation. It was a conference which enjoyed the participation of an exceptional group of outstanding men and women. And in this setting Nelson Mandela stood out. He spoke with a moral authority and in a constructive tone that made a profound impression. This is my personal recollection, but I know that I was not alone in feeling this.

Many people have remarked on the apparent lack of bitterness that characterises Mandela's conduct since he was released from prison. He himself has said that perhaps he would have harboured bitter thoughts if he had not had a job to do. Then he adds as an afterthought that if only all those who have made such great sacrifices for the sake of justice could see that they have not been in vain, that would serve to eliminate the bitterness from their hearts.

The two prize winners, from their highly disparate points of departure, the one from the side of the oppressors and the other from the side of the oppressed, have taken initiatives to break the vicious circle that their country was caught up in. These are initiatives the world has taken note of, initiatives which reflect personal integrity and great political courage on the part of both men. They have both chosen not to dwell on the deep wounds of the past. In so doing, they are different from leaders in many other conflict areas, even though the wounds in South Africa were deeper than perhaps anywhere else. Mandela and de Klerk have chosen reconciliation rather than the alternative, which would inevitably have been an ever more bitter and bloodier conflict. Another aspect of the policy of reconciliation is compromise and the recognition that one must give in order to be able to take. Political action on this basis reflects the highest political virtue. But in order to attain success, all parties must be willing to sacrifice.

Eminent statesmanship has been demonstrated in South Africa, and it is astonishing what has been achieved since Mandela was released in 1990. The institutionalised apartheid regime has been dismantled, a provisional constitution has been adopted, a broadly based Transitional Executive Council has been established. The date for fully democratic elections has been set. There can be no doubt that the main credit for these highly significant steps towards a peaceful transition to a democratic South Africa is due to these two prize winners.

Yet we know that the process is not finished. The danger of setbacks exists. There are groups who are not party to or who have withdrawn from the negotiations. South Africa today is still a society marked by bitterness, fear and violence. The number of people killed while the negotiations have taken place is in the tens of thousands. The vicious circle has not been decisively broken. Thus there are today two competing trends - conflict and reconciliation. In the ongoing process it is vital that all parties demonstrate their good will by doing their utmost to being the violence to an end. It is also essential that the groups now outside the negotiations are drawn into active participation in the continuing process of reconciliation and compromise. There is an unquestionable need for more statesmanship.

Should we, then, have waited to award the prize until the definitive breakthrough of the policy of reconciliation? Some would say so. However, the question is whether it makes sense to talk of a definitive breakthrough. Work for peace and reconciliation requires ceaseless effort. Slackening off means an opening for new conflicts. Thus the Norwegian Nobel Committee, when awarding the Nobel Peace Prize, will always have to enter into processes in one way or another. In his will, Nobel wrote that the prize should be given to the person or persons who in the preceding year have contributed the most for the benefit of peace. It is the conviction of the committee that Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk have made a brilliant contribution and attained astonishing results with their policy of peace and reconciliation. They have given peace a chance. Whether peace will prevail, time will have to show.

Alfred Nobel also intended the institution of the peace prize itself to represent a positive contribution to peace. Thus it is the hope of the Nobel Committee that this year's award will serve as a contribution, however small, for the peaceful development towards complete democracy in South Africa.

It is the privilege of the Norwegian Nobel Committee to award the Nobel Peace Prize. We do so in admiration and deep respect for those who manage to maintain their humanity in a world characterised by fear and brutality, who assume the responsibility to do something about the problems, and who succeed in doing so. The policy of reconciliation that Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk represent provides hope not only for South Africa; it is also a shining example for the world that there are ways out of the vicious circle of violence and bitterness.

II. STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE 1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE BY NELSON MANDELA, PRESIDENT OF THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTH AFRICA

I am indeed truly humbled to be standing here today to receive this year's Nobel Peace Prize.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to the Norwegian Nobel Committee for elevating us to the status of a Nobel Prize winner. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate my compatriot and fellow laureate, State President F. W. de Klerk. on his receipt of this high honour.

Together, we join two distinguished South Africans, the late Chief Albert Luthuli and His Grace Archbishop Desmond Tutu, to whose seminal contributions to the peaceful struggle against the

evil system of apartheid you paid well-deserved tribute by awarding them the Nobel Peace Prize.

It will not be presumptuous of us if we also add, among our predecessors, the name of another outstanding Nobel Peace Prize winner, the late African-American statesman and internationalist, the Rev. Martin Luther King. He, too, grappled with and died in the effort to make a contribution to the just solution of the same great issues of the day which we have had to face as South Africans.

We speak here of the challenge of the dichotomies of war and peace, violence and non-violence, racism and human dignity, oppression and repression and liberty and human rights, poverty and freedom from want.

We stand here today as nothing more than a representative of the millions of our people who dared to rise up against a social system whose very essence is war, violence, racism, oppression, repression and the impoverishment of an entire people.

I am also here today as a representative of the millions of people across the globe, the anti-apartheid movement, the governments and organizations that joined with us, not to fight against South Africa as a country or any of its peoples, but to oppose an inhuman system and sue for a speedy end to the apartheid crime against humanity.

These countless human beings, both inside and outside our country, had the nobility of spirit to stand in the path of tyranny and injustice, without seeking selfish gain. They recognized that an injury to one is an injury to all and therefore acted together in defence of justice and a common human decency. Because of their courage and persistence for many years, we can, today, even set the dates when all humanity will join together to celebrate one of the outstanding human victories of our century.

When that moment comes, we shall, together, rejoice in a common victory over racism, apartheid and white minority rule. That triumph will finally bring to a close a history of five hundred years of African colonization that began with the establishment of the Portuguese empire. Thus, it will mark a great step forward in history and also serve as a common pledge of the peoples of the world to fight racism wherever it occurs and whatever guise it assumes.

At the southern tip of the continent of Africa, a rich reward is in the making, an invaluable gift is in the preparation, for those who suffered in the name of all humanity when they sacrificed everything - for liberty, peace, human dignity and human fulfilment. This reward will not be measured

in money. Nor can it be reckoned in the collective price of the rare metals and precious stones that rest in the bowels of the African soil we tread in the footsteps of our ancestors.

It will and must be measured by the happiness and welfare of the children, at once the most vulnerable citizens in any society and the greatest of our treasures. The children must, at last, play in the open veld, no longer tortured by the pangs of hunger or ravaged by disease or threatened with the scourge of ignorance, molestation and abuse, and no longer required to engage in deeds whose gravity exceeds the demands of their tender years.

In front of this distinguished audience, we commit the new South Africa to the relentless pursuit of the purposes defined in the World Declaration on the Survival, Protection and Development of Children.

The reward of which we have spoken will and must also be measured by the happiness and welfare of the mothers and fathers of these children, who must walk the earth without fear of being robbed, killed for political or material profit, or spat upon because they are beggars. They too must be relieved of the heavy burden of despair which they carry in their hearts, born of hunger, homelessness and unemployment.

The value of that gift to all who have suffered will and must be measured by the happiness and welfare of all the people of our country, who will have torn down the inhuman walls that divided them. These great masses will have turned their backs on the grave insult to human dignity which described some as masters and others as servants, and transformed each into a predator whose survival depended on the destruction of the other.

The value of our shared reward will and must be measured by the joyful peace which will triumph, because the common humanity that binds both Black and White into one race, will have said to each one of us that we shall all live like the children of paradise.

Thus shall we live, because we will have created a society which recognizes that all people are born equal, with each entitled in equal measure to life, liberty, prosperity, human rights and good governance. Such a society should never allow again that there should be prisoners of conscience nor that any person's human rights should be violated. Neither should it ever happen that once more the avenues to peaceful change are blocked by usurpers who seek to take power away from the people in pursuit of their own ignoble purposes.

In relation to these matters, we appeal to those who govern Burma that they release our fellow Nobel Peace Prize laureate,

Aung San Suu Kyi, and engage her and those she represents in serious dialogue for the benefit of all the people of Burma. We pray that those who have the power to do so will, without further delay, permit that she uses her talents and energies for the greater good of the people of her country and humanity as a whole.

Far from the rough and tumble of the politics of our own country, I would like to take this opportunity to join the Norwegian Nobel Committee and pay tribute to my joint laureate, Mr. F. W. de Klerk. He had the courage to admit that a terrible wrong had been done to our country and people through the imposition of the system of apartheid. He had the foresight to understand and accept that all the people of South Africa must, through negotiations and as equal participants in the process, together determine what they want to make of their future.

But there are still some within our country who wrongly believe they can make a contribution to the cause of justice and peace by clinging to the shibboleths that have been proved to spell nothing but disaster. It remains our hope that these, too, will be blessed with sufficient reason to realize that history will not be denied and that the new society cannot be created by reproducing the repugnant past, however refined or enticingly repackaged.

We live with the hope that as she battles to remake herself, South Africa will be like a microcosm of the new world that is striving to be born. This must be a world of democracy and respect for human rights, a world freed from the horrors of poverty, hunger, deprivation and ignorance, relieved of the threat and the scourge of civil wars and external aggression and unburdened of the great tragedy of millions forced to become refugees.

The process, in which South Africa and Southern Africa as a whole are engaged, beckons and urges us all that we take this tide at the flood and make of this region a living example of what all people of conscience would like the world to be.

We do not believe that this Nobel Peace Prize is intended as a commendation for matters that have happened and passed. We hear the voices which say that it is an appeal from all those, throughout the universe, who sought an end to the system of apartheid. We understand their call, that we devote what remains of our lives to the use of our country's unique and painful experience to demonstrate, in practice, that the normal condition for human existence is democracy, justice, peace, non-racism, non-sexism, prosperity for everybody, a healthy environment and equality and solidarity among the peoples.

Moved by that appeal and inspired by the eminence you have thrust upon us, we undertake that we too will do what we can to contribute to the renewal of our world so that none should, in future, be described as the wretched of the earth.

Let it never be said by future generations that indifference, cynicism or selfishness made us fail to live up to the ideals of humanism which the Nobel Peace Prize encapsulates. Let the strivings of us all prove Martin Luther King, Jr. to have been correct when he said that humanity can no longer be tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war.

Let the efforts of us all prove that he was not a mere dreamer when he spoke of the beauty of genuine brotherhood and peace being more precious than diamonds or silver or gold.

III. STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE 1993 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE BY F. W. DE KLERK, STATE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

It is a little more than six years to the end of this century and to the dawning of the new millennium. In three years we will mark the centenary of Alfred Nobel's death and in eight the hundredth year of this award.

The intervening years have witnessed the most dreadful wars and carnage in the long and violent history of mankind. Today as we speak,

- the shells rain down on beleaguered communities in Bosnia;

- there is bitter conflict in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan;

- there are devastating wars and conflicts in Africa - in Angola, in Somalia and recently in Burundi; and

- in my own country, notwithstanding the tremendous progress which we have made, more than 3,000 people have died in political violence since the beginning of this year.

As always, it is the innocent - and particularly the children - who are the main victims of these conflicts. Above all, we owe it to the children of the world to stop the conflicts and to create new horizons for them. They deserve peace and decent opportunities in life. I should like to dedicate this address to them and to all those - such as United Nations

Children's Fund (UNICEF) - who are working to alleviate their plight.

The question that we must ask is whether we are making progress toward the goal of universal peace. Or are we caught up on a treadmill of history, turning forever on the axle of mindless aggression and self-destruction? Has the procession of Nobel Peace laureates since 1901 reflected a general movement by mankind toward peace?

When considering the great honour that has been bestowed on us as recipients of this Peace Prize, we must in all humility ask these questions. We must also consider the nature of peace.

The greatest peace, I believe, is the peace which we derive from our faith in God Almighty; from certainty about our relationship with our Creator. Crises might beset us, battles might rage about us - but if we have faith and the certainty it brings, we will enjoy peace - the peace that surpasses all understanding.

One's religious convictions obviously also translate into a specific approach towards peace in the secular sense. I have time only for a few perspectives on peace in this world and its effect on human relationships.

Peace does not simply mean the absence of conflict. Throughout history, there has been an absence of conflict in many repressive societies. This lack of conflict does not have its roots in harmony, goodwill or the consent of the parties involved but often in fear, ignorance and powerlessness.

There can thus be no real peace without justice or consent. Neither does peace necessarily imply tranquillity.

The affairs of mankind are in incessant flux. No relationship - between individuals or communities or political parties or countries - remains the same from one day to the next. New situations are forever arising and demand constant attention. Tensions build up and need to be defused. Militant radical minorities plan to disrupt peace and need to be contained.

There can thus be no real peace without constant effort, planning and hard work.

Peace, therefore, is not an absence of conflict or a condition of stagnation.

Peace is a frame of mind. It is a frame of mind in which countries, communities, parties and individuals seek to resolve their differences through agreements, through negotiation and compromise, instead of threats, compulsion and violence.

Peace is also a framework. It is a framework consisting of rules, laws, agreements and conventions - a framework providing mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of the inevitable clashes of interest between countries, communities, parties and individuals. It is a framework within which the irresistible and dynamic processes of social, economic and political development can be regulated and accommodated.

In our quest for peace we should constantly ask ourselves what we should do to create conditions in which peace can prosper. It is easy to identify those forces and conditions which militate against it and which must be eradicated:

- peace does not fare well where poverty and deprivation reign;

- it does not flourish where there is ignorance and a lack of education and information;

- repression, injustice and exploitation are inimical with peace;

- peace is gravely threatened by inter-group fear and envy and by the unleashing of unrealistic expectations;

- racial, class and religious intolerance and prejudice are its mortal enemies.

Since the vast proportion of human history has been characterized by such conditions, it should not surprise us that much of history has been a lamentable tale of violence and war.

But there is reason for optimism.

Around the world forces which favour peace are on the move. Amongst those, economic development is fundamentally important. Economic growth, generated by the free market, is transforming societies everywhere:

- it is helping to eliminate poverty and is providing the wealth which is required to address the pressing needs of the poor.

- it is extending education and information to an unprecedented portion of the global population.

- it is changing social and economic relationships and is placing irresistible pressure on archaic political and constitutional systems - whether these are of the left or of the right.

And hand in hand with economic development goes democracy. Wherever economic growth occurs it promotes the establishment of representative and democratic institutions - institutions which invariably develop a framework for peace.

It is highly significant that there has never been a war between genuine and universal democracies. There have been countless wars between totalitarian and authoritarian states. There have been wars between democracies and dictatorships - most often in defence of democratic values or in response to aggression. But there are no instances of truly free and democratic peoples taking up arms against one another. The reasons for this are evident:

- it is difficult to incite people to aggression if they are educated and informed, if their basic rights are properly protected;

- it is difficult to persuade people who have achieved a degree of material well-being to risk all in unnecessary conflict;

- such people will not easily be seduced by militarism or allow themselves to become cannon fodder;

- the media - and particularly television - have stripped war and conflict of any of the glory or illusions which it might once have held.

Through these forces good progress is being made. The present worldwide constitutional development toward democracy, underpinned by economic development, augurs well for peace.

It was also these forces which, more than any other, were responsible for the transformation of my own country and for the awakening of hope for all our people.

The basis for the fundamental reforms in South Africa was established, not by external pressure, but primarily by social changes which economic growth generated.

In as much as apartheid was broken down by pressure, that pressure primarily came - not from an armed struggle - but from the millions of peace-loving people moving to our cities and becoming part of the economy.

The realization that far-reaching change had become inevitable was primarily influenced, not by political speeches and manifestos, but by the exposure to realities which were brought into millions of homes by television and radio.

However, the single most important factor which became the driving force towards a totally new dispensation in South Africa, was a fundamental change of heart. This change occurred on both sides which had been involved in conflict over decades.

It was not a sudden change, but a process - a process of introspection, of soul searching, of repentance; of realization of the futility of ongoing conflict, of acknowledgement of failed policies and the injustice it brought with it.

This process brought the National Party which I lead to the point of making a clean break with apartheid and separate development - a clear break with all forms of discrimination - forever.

Thus we came to the point where we, as South Africans, could begin to bridge the generations of prejudice, enmity and fear which divided us. This process brought us to the negotiating table where we could begin to develop the frame of mind and the frameworks for peace to which I referred earlier. They prepared the way to the new South African Constitution now being debated in Parliament. It, inter alia, provides for:

- the establishment of a rechtstaat, a constitutional system where the law - the constitution and a Bill of Rights - will be sovereign;

- the protection of a basic rights of all individuals, communities and cultural groups through a Bill of Rights, in accordance with that which is universally acceptable;

- an independent Constitutional Court, that will act as the guardian of the constitution and the Bill of Rights;

- clearly defined constitutional principles with which any future constitution will have to comply;

- a balanced division of functions and powers between strong provincial governments based on federal principles, and a strong central government; and

- special majorities and mechanisms for constitutional amendments and the resolution of disputes.

I believe that this transitional constitution provides a reasonable framework of agreements and rules, of checks and balances, which are necessary for peace in our complex society.

It ensures full participation in all fields of endeavour to all South Africans. It does not discriminate in any way on the basis of colour, creed, class or gender.

It contains all the major safeguards which our communities will need to maintain their respective identities and ways of life. It also provides adequate guarantees for the political, social, cultural and economic rights of individuals.

I believe that this framework for peace which we have agreed upon will succeed if we can now establish the frame of mind, to which I referred, which is necessary for peace - the frame of mind which leads people to resolve differences through negotiation, compromise and agreements instead of compulsion and violence.

I believe that such a frame of mind already exists in South Africa at the moment, however fragile it might be. All our leaders, including Mr. Mandela and I, will have to lead by example in an effort to consolidate this frame of mind. We will need great wisdom to counteract the strategies of minority elements, threatening with civil conflict. We will have to be firm and resolute in defending the framework for peace which we agreed upon.

There is no room for complacency. All of us who believe in peace must redouble our efforts to reassure all our countrymen that their rights and security will be assured.

I have no doubt that we will succeed. There is a growing awareness among all South Africans of our interdependence - of the fact that none of us can flourish if we do not work together - that all of us will fail if we try to pursue narrow sectional interests.

Five years ago people would have seriously questioned the sanity of anyone who would have predicted that Mr. Mandela and I would be joint recipients of the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize. And yet both of us are here before you today.

We are political opponents. We disagree strongly on key issues and we will soon fight a strenuous election campaign against one another. But we will do so, I believe, in the frame of mind and within the framework of peace which has already been established.

We will do it - and many other leaders will do it with us - because there is no other road to peace and prosperity for the people in our country. In the conflicts of the past, there was no gain for anyone in South Africa. Through reconciliation all of us are now becoming winners.

The compromises we have reached demand sacrifices on all sides. It was not easy for the supporters of Mr. Mandela or mine to relinquish the ideals they had cherished for many decades. But we did it. And because we did it, there is hope.

The coming election will not be about the past. It will be about the future. It will not be about Blacks and Whites, of Afrikaners or Xhosas. It will be about the best solution for the future in the interest of all our people. It will not be about apartheid or armed struggle. It will be about future peace and stability, about progress and prosperity, about nation-building.

In my first speech after becoming leader of my party, I said on 8 February 1989:

> "Our goal is a new South Africa:
> A totally changed South Africa;
> a South Africa which has rid itself of the antagonism of the past;
> a South Africa free of domination or oppression in whatever form;
> a South Africa within which the democratic forces - all reasonable people - align themselves behind mutually acceptable goals and against radicalism, irrespective of where it comes from".

Since then we have made impressive progress, thanks to the cooperation of political, spiritual, business and community leaders over a wide spectrum. To Mr. Mandela I sincerely say: "Congratulations". Your contribution to peace has been a great one. And in accepting this Peace Prize today I wish to pay tribute to all who are working for peace in our land. On behalf of all South Africans who supported me, directly or indirectly, on behalf of all of them I accept it in humility, deeply aware of my own shortcomings.

I thank those who decided to make the award for the recognition they have granted in doing so - recognition of a mighty deed of reformation and reconciliation that is taking place in South Africa. The road ahead is still full of obstacles and, therefore, dangerous. There is, however, no question of turning back.

One of the great poets in Afrikaans, N. P. van Wyk Louw, wrote:

> "O wye en droewe land, alleen
> Onder die groot suidersterre.
> Sal nooit 'n hoë blydskap kom
> deur jou stil droefenis? ...
> Sal nooit 'n matige skoonheid kom
> oor jou soos die haelwit somerwolk
> wat uitbloei oor jou donker berge,
> en nooit in jou 'n daad geskied
> wat opklink oor die aarde en
> die jare in hul onmag terge; ..."

Translated freely it means:

"Oh wide and woeful land, alone
Beneath the great south stars.
Will soaring joy ne'er rise above
Your silent grief?
Will ne'er a mighty beauty rise
above you, like the hail-white summer clouds
that billow o'er your brooding peaks
and in you, ne'er a deed be wrought
that over the earth resounds
and mocks the ages in their impotence?"

What is taking place in South Africa is such a deed - a deed resounding over the earth - a deed of peace. It brings hope to all South Africans. It opens new horizons for Sub-Saharan Africa. It has the capacity to unlock the tremendous potential of our country and our region. It can and will I believe make a contribution to world peace.

The new era which is dawning in our country, beneath the great southern stars, will lift us out of the silent grief of our past and into a future in which there will be opportunity and room, space for joy and beauty - for prosperity, for real and lasting peace.